

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and discussion that follows. Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 10, 14, 18, 25, and 27 have been amended, and claims 9 and 24 have been cancelled. Applicants have amended claims 5 and 18 to correct typographical errors. The phrase “further comprises” was unintentionally repeated in each of these claims. The amendments reflect only the removal of this typographical error, and do not incorporate any new matter into the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8, 14-21, and 27-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,744,879 to Dezonno. After a careful review of the claims, and in view of the amendments to the claims, the rejections are traversed, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Regarding the independent claims 1 and 27, these claims have been amended to include prioritizing call types based upon the predetermined business rule, wherein the step of prioritizing call types further comprises identifying a first call type with a highest relative priority and a lowest relative average speed of answer and a second call type with a lowest relative priority and a highest relative average speed of answer. Neither Dezonno nor any of the other cited references does teach this feature. Dezonno teaches average handling time (AHT) per call. Column 5, lines 51-54 of Dezonno states that “revenue may also be determined by dividing the revenue per call by the time period (i.e., the average handling time (AHT)) of the call (e.g., in minutes and seconds) to provide an average revenue per time period.” Average handling time describes the amount of time required for an agent to complete a sale or transaction with a customer. Average handling time is not what the Applicants claim. Applicants claim an average speed of answer, (see Applicants’ specification, paragraphs 46-47), which refers to the time required for an agent to answer an incoming call. Furthermore, the cited references do not teach

identifying the relative priority of call types. Therefore claims 1 and 27 are now believed to be allowable.

Regarding independent claim 14, the claim has been amended to include all the elements of Applicants' former claim 24, which Examiner noted would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Therefore, claim 14 is now believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-8, 10-13, 15-23, 25-26, and 28-31 depend on an allowable base claim and include additional, novel subject matter of the invention. Therefore these claims are believed to be allowable.

Allowance of claims 1-31, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By 
Jon P. Christensen
Registration No. 34,137

September 16, 2004
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500